

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-30 and 37-78 are pending.

Claims 1-7, 9, 11-16, 18, 19, 21-23, 25, 26, 30, 37-43, 45, 47-52, 54, 55, 57-59, 61, 62, 66-69, 71-75, and 78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schilling et al. (US Patent No. 5,706,097) and Lowitz et al. (US Patent No. 5,485,554).

Claims 8, 17, 20, 27-29, 44, 53, 56, 63-65, 70, and 77 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schelling/Lowitz and Gibbon et al. (US Patent No. 6,098,082).

Claims 10 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schelling/Lowitz/Gibbon and Geaghan et al. (US Patent No. 5,790,114).

Claims 24, 60, and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schelling/Lowitz and Geaghan.

There are six independent claims among the 72 pending claims.

Independent claim 1 recites generating a printable representation of multimedia information comprising a first type of information and a second type of information. Layout information is accessed which specifies how the first type and second type of information are to be printed on a paper medium. The printable representation is generated based upon the layout information, and comprises a printable representation for information of the first type of information and a printable representation for information of the second type of information. See also independent claims 37 and 67.

Independent claim 21 recites generating a printable representation of multimedia information that includes video information. One or more video keyframes in the multimedia information are printed in a first area of a page of a paper document; the video keyframes being extracted from the video information occurring during a given time span. Also, text information is printed in a second area of the page of the paper document, where the text information is extracted from the multimedia information occurring during the above-given time span. See also independent claims 57 and 74.

Rejection of Claims 1, 37, and 67

Schelling does not show “layout information” for specifying how to print first type of information in the multimedia document and specifying how to print second type of information in the multimedia document as recited in claims 1, 37, and 67. However, the Office action asserted that “computers have settings and layout information for printing documents, and it is also well known that computers enable users to select a ‘print preview’ or ‘print layout’ for automatically generating printable representations for documents according to a layout.” *O.A. at page 3*. First, it is noted that the conventional “print preview” feature in computers simply provides a user with a preview of the document that will be printed. There is no layout information that specifies how the first type and second type of information in a multimedia document are to be printed on the paper medium.

As to the “print layout” feature, this feature is not as common as “print preview.” The examiner is respectfully requested under MPEP Section 2144.03 to provide documentary evidence which describes the “print layout” feature. As best understood, “print layout” refers to the organization of the printing of multiple documents, and the following discussion is based on this understanding. As originally recited in claims 1, 37, and 67, the layout information specifies “how the multimedia information stored by the multimedia document is to be printed on a paper medium;” i.e., the layout information is directed to *the content*. By comparison, “print layout” as best understood *is not* directed to how the content is arranged on the document but rather is directed to the arrangement of multiple documents. Claims 1, 37, and 67 have been amended to more clearly recite this aspect of the recited layout information, reciting “how the first type of information [in the multimedia document] is to be printed on a paper medium and ... how the second type of information [in the multimedia document] is to be printed on the paper medium.” The “print layout” feature as best understood does not include layout information that specifies how the first type of information and second type of information is to be printed on the paper medium.

Lowitz likewise does not show layout information that specifies how the first type of information and second type of information is to be printed on the paper medium, disclosing only techniques for printing frames of video. Nonetheless, Lowitz was cited at column 4, lines

8-25 for teaching the recited “automatically generating the printable representation ... based upon the layout information.” The layout information of Lowitz includes controlling the size, position, and format of one or more video images. *Col. 4, lines 8 and 9*. However, the layout information of Lowitz is not directed to the contents of the video images; i.e., Lowitz does not identify a first type of information and a second type of information in the video images. The layout information of Lowitz thus does not specify “how the first type of information is to be printed on a paper medium and ... how the second type of information is to be printed on the paper medium” as recited in claims 1, 37, and 67.

The rejection of claims 1, 37, and 67 and their respective dependent claims is believed to be overcome.

Rejection of Claims 21, 57, and 74

Schelling teaches that “textual information relating to the file such as the subject of the image or sound sequence, the date and time of recording of the data, the author of the data, a location or event related to the data, or file size or duration of the sequence, may be added to the subject matter descriptor.” *Col. 3, lines 21-25*. However, Schelling does not disclose that such textual information “is extracted from the multimedia information” as recited in the pending claims. Moreover, Schelling does not teach that the textual information “is extracted from the multimedia information occurring during the time span associated with the page.”

Lowitz discloses at column 8, lines 24-34 selecting a portion of a frame of input video and processing it as printable image data and correlating the selected portion with the input video using an identifier; e.g., “a specific frame of the input video data stream in the video memory.” *Id at lines 31 and 32*. Lowitz also discloses at column 11, lines 4-8 that information such as an index to identify a sequential location (e.g., time code) can be printed. However, none of these teachings read on the recited textual information extracted from the multimedia information occurring during the time span associated with the page. Lowitz does not teach extracting textual information from the multimedia information; rather, Lowitz teaches printing an identifier or an index, neither of which is textual information extracted from the multimedia

Appl. No. 10/001,895
Amdt. sent February 1, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 3, 2005

PATENT

information. Lowitz does not teach the extraction of text from a time span in of the multimedia information.


The rejection of independent claims 21, 57, and 74 and their respective dependent claims is believed to be overcome.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,


George B.F. Yee
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400 Fax: 415-576-0300
GBFY:cmm
60559801 v1